

REMARKS

The specification is objected to by the Examiner, as cited in the office action. The specification has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections.

The Figs. 2-3 drawings are objected to by the Examiner, as cited in the office action. Corrected Figs. 2-3 are attached.

Claims 1, 5, 9, 20, 24 and 26 are objected to by the Examiner, as cited in the office action. Claims 1, 5, 9, 20, 24 and 26 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 19 and 24-27 under 35 USC §112, as cited in the office action. In a telephone interview with the Examiner, it was agreed that the rejection of claim 5 would be removed. Claims 19 and 24-27 has been amended to overcome the rejections.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-16 and 28-30 under 35 USC §103(a) for the reasons cited in the office action. Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, and 16 as discussed in a telephone interview with the Examiner to overcome the prior art.

Nowhere is it taught or even suggested in any of the cited references by the Examiner to use a speed control with a system controller to produce a desired operational output frequency from a generator to meet operational conditions of electrical motor load.

In view of the aforementioned remarks and amendments, it is believed that claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/John J. Elnitski, Jr./

John J. Elnitski, Jr.

Registration No. 39,968

225 A Snowbird Lane

Bellefonte, PA 16823

(814) 355-7646